# THE ENCYCLOPAEDIA OF ISLAM

## NEW EDITION

PREPARED BY A NUMBER OF
LEADING ORIENTALISTS

EDITED BY

**B. LEWIS, Ch. PELLAT AND J. SCHACHT**

ASSISTED BY J. BURTON-PAGE, C. DUMONT AND V. L. MÉNAGE AS
EDITORIAL SECRETARIES

UNDER THE PATRONAGE OF
THE INTERNATIONAL UNION OF ACADEMIES

## VOLUME II

## C—G

FOURTH IMPRESSION

LEIDEN
E. J. BRILL
1991

[see ADHWĀ']. In addition, two Muslim names of months: *Dhu 'l-ḥidjdja*, *Dhu 'l-ḳa'da* [see TA'RĪKH, i].

*Bibliography*: in the text. In addition: J. Barth, *Die Pronominalbildung in den semitischen Sprachen*, Leipzig 1913, 103-16, 152-8; for modern dialects: W. Fischer, *Die demonstrativen Bildungen der neuarabischen Dialekte*, The Hague 1959, 57-98. (H. FLEISCH)

**DHU 'L-FAḲĀR**, the name of the famous sword which Muḥammad obtained as booty in the battle of Badr; it previously belonged to a heathen named al-'Āṣ b. Munabbih, killed in the battle. It is mentioned in the *Sīra* (ed. Saḳḳā, etc., 1375/1955), ii, 100, and in several *ḥadīth*s (see for example Ibn Sa'd, ii, 2, section: *fī suyūf al-Nabī*. The expression Dhu 'l-Faḳār is explained by the presence on this sword of notches (*fuḳra*) or grooves (cf. the expression *sayf muḳaḳḳar*). According to a tradition, the sword bore an inscription referring to blood-money which ended with the words *lā yuḳtal Muslim bi-kāfir* "no Muslim shall be slain for an unbeliever". The proverbial expression *lā sayf illā Dhu 'l-Faḳār* has often been inscribed on finely engraved swords, from the middle ages down to our own times, throughout the Muslim world. The words *wa-lā fatā illā 'Alī* are sometimes added, because, although Muḥammad's sword, after belonging to 'Alī, passed into the possession of the 'Abbāsid caliphs, it became an attribute of 'Alī and an 'Alid symbol. Muslim iconography represented it with two points, probably in order to mark its magical character (the two points were used to put out the eyes of an enemy; for a representation of a sword with two points, among other magic objects, see V. Monteil, in *REI*, 1940/i-ii, 22). Dhu 'l-Faḳār became a proper name which is found more particularly among Shī'īs.

*Bibliography*: F. W. Schwarzlose, *Die Waffen der alten Araber*, Leipzig 1886, 152; G. Zawadowski, *Note sur l'origine magique de Dhoû-l-Faqâr*, in *En Terre d'Islam*, 1943/I, 36-40. (E. MITTWOCH*)

**DHU 'L-FAḲĀRIYYA**, (alternatively *Faḳāriyya*, *Zulfaḳāriyya*); a Mamlūk household and political faction in Egypt during the 17th and 18th centuries.

(1) Origin and first ascendancy. The eponymous founder of the household, Dhu 'l-Faḳār Bey, is a shadowy figure, who seems to have flourished in the first third of the 17th century, but is not mentioned by contemporary chroniclers. The account (in Djabartī, *'Adjā'ib al-Āthār*, i, 21-3) which makes Dhu 'l-Faḳār and the rival eponym, Ḳāsim, contemporaries of sultan Selīm I is legendary. The political importance of the Faḳāriyya began with the *amīr al-ḥadjdjī* Riḍwān Bey, a *mamlūk* of the eponym (Muḥammad al-Muḥibbī, *Khulāṣat al-Āthār*, Būlāḳ, 1290; ii, 164-6). He held the command of the Pilgrimage for over twenty years until his death in Djumādā II 1066/April 1656. The grandees of his household dominated the Egyptian political scene until Ṣafar 1071/October 1660, when their rivals, the Ḳāsimiyya faction, joined with the Ottoman viceroy to overthrow them. Their forces and leaders were dispersed, several of the Faḳārī beys being put to death at al-Ṭarrāna by the Ḳāsimī, Aḥmad Bey the Bosniak.

(2) The Ḳāsimī ascendancy. For over forty years after the Ṭarrāna episode, the Faḳāriyya remained in a state of diminished power and prestige. The Ḳāsimiyya, although the dominant faction, did not display the arrogance and turbulence *vis-à-vis* the viceroys which had characterized the Faḳāriyya during their ascendancy. The disturbances of this period originated mainly in the garrison of Cairo. By 1123/1711-12, however, a dangerous political polarization had developed. The Faḳāriyya and Ḳāsimiyya were allied respectively with the much older factions of Sa'd and Ḥarām among the Egyptian artisans and nomads. In a quarrel between the Janissaries and 'Azabs in that year, the Faḳāriyya supported the former and the Ḳāsimiyya the latter. The Ḳāsimiyya-'Azab combination was ultimately victorious, but the death during the fighting of Īwāẓ ('Iwaḍ) Bey, the leading Ḳāsimī grandee, opened a vendetta between the two factions which dragged on for two decades. Finally in 1142/1729-30, the Faḳāriyya succeeded in extirpating their rivals, and restoring their own ascendancy.

(3) The second ascendancy of the Faḳāriyya. The architect of the Faḳārī triumph, another Dhu 'l-Faḳār Bey, (who was assassinated on the eve of victory), came, not from the original Mamlūk household deriving from Riḍwān Bey, but from a household established by a regimental officer of Anatolian (*Rūmī*) origin, Ḥasan Balfiyya, *agha* of the Gönüllüs, who flourished in the late 11th/17th century. Another branch of this household stemmed from Muṣṭafā al-Ḳāzdughlī, also an Anatolian, who entered the service of Ḥasan Agha. The predominance of the Ḳāzdughliyya branch was established by Ibrāhīm Kâhya, who in 1156/1743-44 allied with Riḍwān Kâhya al-Djulfī to oust 'Uthmān Bey, a *mamlūk* of the late Dhu 'l-Faḳār Bey and holder of the supremacy (*ri'āsa*) in Egypt. The Ḳāzdughliyya, hitherto a regimental household, now entered the beylicate, several of Ibrāhīm Kâhya's *mamlūk*s being appointed beys, both before and after his death in Ṣafar 1168/November-December 1754. Amongst them was Bulut Kapan 'Alī Bey, usually called 'Alī Bey the Great (see 'ALĪ BEY). In spite of the inveterate rivalry among the Ḳāzdughliyya grandees, they maintained their ascendancy, ultimately embodied in the duumvirate of Ibrāhīm Bey and Murād Bey, until the French invasion under Bonaparte in 1798.

*Bibliography*: Abū 'Abd Allāh Muḥammad b. Muḥammad b. Abi 'l-Surūr, *al-Rawḍa al-zahiyya* and *al-Kawākib al-sā'ira*, (Brockelmann, II, 297-8; 8, 409); the author was a friend of Riḍwān Bey; Anonymous, *Zubdat iḵhtiṣār ta'rīḵh mulūk Miṣr al-maḥrūsa*, (B.M., Add. 9972); anonymous fragment, Bibliothèque nationale, MS. arabe 1855; 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Ḥasan al-Djabartī, *'Adjā'ib al-Āthār fi 'l-tarādjim wa 'l-aḵhbār*, Būlāḳ 1290. See also P. M. Holt, *The exalted lineage of Riḍwān Bey: some observations on a seventeenth-century Mamluk genealogy*, in *BSOAS*, xxii/2, 1959, 221-30. (P. M. HOLT)

**DHU 'L-ḤIDJDJA** [see TA'RĪKH, i].

**DHU 'L-HIMMA** or DHĀT AL-HIMMA, name of the principal heroine of a romance of Arab chivalry entitled, in the 1327/1909 edition, *Sīrat al-amīra Dhāt al-Himma wa-waladihā 'Abd al-Wahhāb wa 'l-amīr Abū* (*sic*) *Muḥammad al-Baṭṭāl wa-'Uḳba shaykh al-ḍalāl wa-Shūmadris al-muḥtāl*, which, in the subtitle, describes itself as "the greatest history of the Arabs, and the Umayyad and 'Abbāsid caliphs, comprising the history of the Arabs and their wars ..... and including their amazing conquests". Also known is the title *Sīrat al-mudjāhidīn wa-abṭāl al-muwaḥḥidīn al-amīra Dhū* (*sic*) *'l-Himma wa-'Abd al-Wahhāb* etc. (catalogue of Vienna MSS by Flügel, ii, 13). Cf. also Brockelmann, S II, 65 and Sarkis, *Dict. encycl.*, xi, 1930, 2008.

The main subject of this romance is the Arab

war against the Byzantines from the Umayyad period until the end of al-Wāṯiḳ's caliphate, that is to say it covers in principle the first, second and third centuries of the Hidjra, but also reflects later events. Though this is the general character of the romance, it also has an equally important but individual character as the history of the rivalry between two Arab tribes, the B. Kilāb and the B. Sulaym, the key to a whole series of vicissitudes in the *Sīra* and to the course of action taken by the leading figures, and it may indeed be regarded as the epic of the B. Kilāb tribe. In the edition noted above it covers a total of 5084 pages in 8vo with 27 lines to the page, in 7 volumes of 10 sections (*djuz'*) each, with 64 pages in each section except for sections 69 and 70 which have 92 and 158 pages respectively.

The name of the heroine appears in different forms. She is often called simply Dalhama or al-Dalhama, and this might be her original name, the feminine of Dalham, a well-known proper name and appellation signifying wolf. It has been regarded as a vulgarism for a name beginning with *dhū* (cf. *Abu 'l-* becoming *Bal*), which could be reconstructed as Dhu 'l-Himma, and then, as it refers to a woman, as Dhāt al-Himma, the woman of noble purpose. In the edition and the different manuscripts all these forms occur concurrently, even Dhu 'l-Himma al-Dalhama or Dhu 'l-dalhama. It is by the name Delhemma that the romance is most generally known. But whilst several of the characters have a historical prototype, the heroine herself seems never to have existed historically.

Contents of the romance. The starting point is the history in the Umayyad period of the rivalry between two Ḳaysī tribes in the Ḥidjāz, the B. Kilāb and the B. Sulaym, the former belonging to the ʿĀmir b. Ṣaʿṣaʿa group, a section of the Hawāzin who, with the Sulaym, are one of the two principal branches of Ḳays ʿAylān. The head of the Kilāb was Djandaba b. al-Ḥārith b. ʿĀmir b. Khālid b. Ṣaʿṣaʿa b. Kilāb, while the head of the Sulaym was Marwān b. al-Haytham. It was the latter, a favourite of the Umayyad caliph, who, despite the superiority which Djandaba had won by his exploits, held the *imāra* (command) over the Arab troops. But after Djandaba's death his son al-Ṣaḥṣāḥ, having saved the daughter of caliph ʿAbd al-Malik b. Marwān, and sister of Maslama b. ʿAbd al-Malik, when she was attacked by Bedouin brigands on her return from the pilgrimage, won Maslama's friendship and, thanks to him, was given the *imāra*. It was as head of the Arab tribes that he took part with Maslama in a great expedition against Constantinople, in the course of which he had romantic adventures in a fortress (a monastery in the corresponding episode in the ʿUmar al-Nuʿmān's tale in the 1001 Nights) inhabited by a Greek princess who fell in love with him after a show of resistance and whom he carried off. He was the hero in the fighting outside Constantinople against the emperor Leo and his generals and allies, one of whom was the queen of Georgia, Bakhtūs. After foiling the devilish plots of Shammās, a monk, he entered the town as victor with Maslama, had a mosque built there and had Shammās crucified.

The romance then relates al-Ṣaḥṣāḥ's adventures in the desert with other women, one of whom was a *djinniyya*, his death while hunting, the disputes over the succession between his two sons Ẓālim and Maẓlūm, the birth of Ẓālim's son, al-Ḥārith, and Maẓlūm's daughter, Fāṭima who, having been carried off in a raid with her nurse and foster-brother Marzūk by the B. Ṭayy, grew up among that tribe, became a fearsome amazon and was given the name of Dalhama (Dhāt al-Himma). Returning to her own tribe as a result of romantic events too lengthy to describe here, she continued to astound the Kilāb by her exploits. It was in these circumstances that the revolution which brought the ʿAbbāsids to power took place. The amīr of the B. Sulaym at that time, ʿAbd Allāh (ʿUbayd Allāh) b. Marwān, supported the ʿAbbāsid cause and obtained from al-Manṣūr command over the tribes which from then onwards was lost by al-Ṣaḥṣāḥ's successor. Delhemma persuaded the Kilāb, despite their initial reluctance, to support the new dynasty. The Byzantines having taken advantage of the change of dynasty to regain the initiative, war broke out again and the two tribes, Kilāb and Sulaym, took part in it at the caliph's request, acquiescing in ʿUbayd Allāh's leadership. They freed Āmid, captured Malaṭya and took up positions to defend the frontiers, the Sulaym at Malaṭya, the Kilāb in the nearby fortress of Ḥiṣn al-Kawkab.

It was after this development that Delhemma's cousin al-Ḥārith, son of the Kilābī amīr Ẓālim, succeeded in overcoming the rebellious heroine's repugnance to love and marriage, aided by a drug (*bandj*) supplied by the *faḳīh*, later *ḳāḍī* ʿUḳba, of the Sulaym tribe, and made her the mother of a child, ʿAbd al-Wahhāb who, as a result of the strange circumstances in which the conception took place, was black. ʿAbd al-Wahhāb was educated by his mother and, on reaching manhood, became the head of the Kilāb and the Blacks who formed a group under his leadership; he was the chief hero of the romance together with Delhemma, and won fame in the incessant wars against Byzantium. At his side was al-Baṭṭāl, a Sulaymī and pupil of the *ḳāḍī* ʿUḳba, playing an important part but relying on cunning rather than on force of arms. In the perpetual rivalry that existed between the two tribes al-Baṭṭāl took the side of the Kilāb, left Malaṭya for the Kilāb's fortress and became the implacable enemy of the *ḳāḍī* ʿUḳba who was secretly converted to Christianity and had become a traitor to Islam and the Byzantines' most valuable auxiliary. The amīr of Malaṭya and head of the Arab tribes was now ʿAmr b. ʿAbd Allāh (ʿUbayd Allāh). Although he had concluded a pact of fraternity with ʿAbd al-Wahhāb and had been rescued by Delhemma from the hands of the Byzantines and their allies the "Christianized Arabs", a band whom Delhemma's ephemeral husband al-Ḥārith had led into Greek territory and placed at the emperor's service, he remained in a state of veiled hostility to the Kilāb and their leaders. If the Byzantines had valuable assistants like ʿUḳba and the "Christianized Arabs", the Muslims also had accomplices in Byzantine territory, in a small group of crypto-Muslims organized by Māris, the emperor's personal chamberlain, and his brother and sister, and also, near Malaṭya, an ally in the person of Yānis, of the imperial family and lord of a Greek fortress which he put at the disposal of the Muslims.

In the reign of al-Mahdī a great battle with the emperor Theophilus took place at Mardj al-ʿUyūn. Then the narrator, after a romantic account of al-Mahdī's death, takes us to the reign of Hārūn al-Rashīd, whom he speaks of as the immediate successor of al-Mahdī, and in Byzantium to the reign of Manuel, son of Theophilus. It was at this point that the great duel between al-Baṭṭāl and ʿUḳba began, each trying to seize his adversary and

have him put to death, and, as the Sulaym, their amīr and the caliph supported and defended ʿUḳba whose treason they refused to acknowledge despite the proof provided by Delhemma, ʿAbd al-Wahhāb and al-Baṭṭāl, in consequence the Kilāb only took part in the war to save the situation when it had been rendered critical by the Byzantines' successes in capturing and even advancing beyond Malaṭya, or else to fight against the emperor and the caliph who were linked together in an unnatural alliance against the Kilāb, or else to go off into far distant lands beyond Byzantium to rescue ʿAbd al-Wahhāb's wife and daughter. Adventures which cannot be related here led al-Baṭṭāl into the West, whence he brought back a Frankish king whom he converted, and a little later to the Maghrib, returning with a contingent of Berbers. Subsequently the two tribes were reconciled and secured victories over the Byzantines near the Cilician Gates, recapturing Malaṭya from them and imposing a truce.

The narrator then tells, after the death of Hārūn al-Rashīd, of the war between al-Amīn and al-Maʾmūn in which the Kilāb fought against al-Amīn whilst the Sulaym supported him. The amīrs of the Kilāb who had been summoned to Baghdād, with the exception of al-Baṭṭāl who had escaped, were arrested by ʿAmr at the instigation of Zubayda, she in turn being inspired by ʿUḳba. A fratricidal struggle then broke out between the Sulaym, reinforced by troops from ʿIrāḳ, and the Kilāb and ʿĀmir. The Kilāb overcame the Sulaym and the ʿAbbāsid troops, reached Baghdād, attacked the palace, set free the Kilābite amīrs and took al-Amīn prisoner, but were persuaded by ʿAbd al-Wahhāb and Delhemma to release him. However, some of the Kilāb still continued to support al-Maʿmūn.

The emperor Michael, Manuel's successor, taking advantage of the civil war between al-Amīn and al-Maʾmūn, on ʿUḳba's advice renewed hostilities. Al-Maʾmūn, who had been supported by al-Baṭṭāl, came to the throne but had Delhemma, ʿAbd al-Wahhāb and the Kilābī amīrs who had helped al-Amīn arrested. The caliph, following the not disinterested advice of ʿUḳba, the emperor's ally, set off in the direction of al-Raḳḳa and was captured, together with the Kilābīs whom he had taken with him, and they were all carried off to Constantinople. Delhemma was at once freed by al-Baṭṭāl. The others regained their liberty under cover of a war against the emperor that had been launched by a king named Kushānūsh, grandson through his father of the king of the Bulgars (al-Burdjān) and through his mother descended from Nestor, king of the Maghlabites (sic). Kushānūsh captured Constantinople, and then in his turn renewed the struggle with Islam and penetrated as far as Baṣra. He was finally captured by the Kilāb and beheaded by Delhemma herself. Thanks to the Kilāb, the emperor was freed and restored to the throne, and he decided for the future to give them the tribute which, in the past, he had paid to the caliph, a step which led to some jealousy of the Kilāb. However, the emperor resumed war against the caliph whom he compelled to take refuge in Persia with the Sulaym. Once again it was the Kilāb who saved the situation. Then they hastily started new operations, this time by sea, with the help of the amīr of Tarsus, ʿAlī al-Armanī, against the king of a remote island named Ḳarāḳūna who was holding some Kilābī women captive. But on hearing that al-Maʾmūn had come to lay siege to Constantinople and been captured with the help of the Franks, they hurried to the rescue, fought a naval engagement and laid siege to the city; they captured the emperor and then, reinforced by an army commanded by the future caliph al-Muʿtaṣim, they set al-Maʾmūn free; he had however been wounded by ʿUḳba and died. Al-Muʿtaṣim took over power, at al-Baṭṭāl's request set free the emperor Michael, who was to pay tribute, and gave orders to return to Malaṭya where for the time being he effected a reconciliation between the Kilāb and the Sulaym, later returning to Baghdād.

But soon afterwards he was won over by the amīr ʿAmr to the side of the Sulaym and ʿUḳba. He came to Malaṭya with the intention of invading Byzantine territory, arrested Delhemma, ʿAbd al-Wahhāb and the Kilābī amīrs, and also al-Baṭṭāl shortly afterwards, while ʿAmr released ʿUḳba whom al-Baṭṭāl after prolonged search had finally captured. An attempt by the Kilāb to rescue the prisoners on their way to Baghdād failed on account of the superiority of al-Muʿtaṣim's and ʿAmr's forces. Thereafter the Kilāb seem to have been powerless against the Sulaym and ʿAmr. Those of the Kilāb and ʿAbd al-Wahhāb's Blacks who were unwilling to submit to ʿAmr emigrated to Egypt. While the amīrs were held prisoner in Baghdād the emperor, urged on by ʿUḳba, launched an expedition. But he was soon besieged in his capital by Baḥrūn, the king of the island of Ḳamarān, and dethroned. Baḥrūn then invaded the Muslim territories, took Malaṭya, captured ʿAmr and later the caliph, and marched on ʿIrāḳ. It was then that the Kilābī amīrs were released during a riot. They at once out to fight Baḥrūn, defeated him and released his prisoners, and helped the caliph to recapture Constantinople and restore the emperor to his throne. They took the town of ʿAmūdā the Great, towards which Baḥrūn had fled, and once again freed the caliph who had been captured for the second time.

However, the emperor Michael had died and been succeeded by the usurper Armānūs (Romanus), who expelled the Muslims from Constantinople and was joined by Baḥrūn. Fighting continued, and an interminable series of adventures brought the Kilāb to the kingdom of Kordjāna, bordering on the country of the Abkhāz, in their search for Delhemma who was still a prisoner, while the Sulaym accompanied by the caliph had returned to Malaṭya. Then followed a great offensive by Armānūs who took Malaṭya and went as far as Mosul. The Kilāb, who through ʿUḳba's intrigues had been expelled from the frontier by the caliph, nevertheless saved the situation. Then the caliph became suspicious of ʿAmr, but the latter returned to favour, set out an on expedition, and was defeated. Finally Armānūs was overcome and surrendered. He was soon compelled to seek help from the Muslims against his enemy king Karfanās who, with the Saḳāriḳa and the Malāfiṭa (Amalfitans) captured Constantinople. The caliph sent the Sulaym against him. Karfanās captured ʿAmr, defeated the caliph al-Muʿtaṣim and reached Āmid. At that point ʿAbd al-Wahhāb intervened. Karfanās was killed and Armānūs regained the throne.

The narrator, who is not unaware that al-Muʿtaṣim led an expedition against Amorium in 223/838, does not fail to describe it in a fanciful way, with certain characteristics which recur in an already legendary account by Ibn al-ʿArabī in his *Muḥāḍarāt al-abrār wa-musāmarāt al-akhyār*, ii, 64. Then he had Armānūs dethroned by his own son Bīmund. The latter maltreated al-Baṭṭāl, who had fallen into the hands

of Armānūs, and thereby provoked ʿAbd al-Wahhāb and ʿAmr to intervene. The latter was made prisoner. Delhemma then came to the rescue, killed Bīmund and restored Armānūs to the throne.

ʿUḳba once more contrived to turn the caliph against the Kilāb, and the Sulaym and Kilāb were again at war, when the caliph called in Armānūs against the Kilāb. There followed a long series of exploits in the course of which, outside Constantinople, Delhemma killed a Frankish king, Mīlāṣ, who had come for the Crusade and conquest of Jerusalem, ʿAbd al-Wahhāb was carried off by the Pečenegs, ʿUḳba and al-Baṭṭāl continued their perpetual game of hide and seek, and Armānūs took and sacked Malaṭya. Armānūs was later dethroned and strangled by Fālūghus (Paleologos?) whom Delhemma forced to keep peace. He resumed the war but was beaten and compelled to pay tribute and to rebuild in Constantinople Maslama's mosque which had fallen into ruin. ʿUḳba, whom al-Baṭṭāl had captured, was nearly crucified in Constantinople, but he managed to escape and returned to the caliph; he hatched a new plot against the Kilāb and procured the arrest of ʿAbd al-Wahhāb and al-Baṭṭāl, and it was only by the vizier's help that they escaped from the sentence of death by drowning in the Tigris. Nevertheless, ʿAmr and the Sulaym continued to fight against the Kilāb.

A new emperor named Michael twice sent expeditions against the Muslims, the second time with a Frankish king Takafūr. He took Malaṭya but it was recaptured by the caliph and ʿAbd al-Wahhāb; it was then that al-Muʿtaṣim, after seeing ʿUḳba performing his devotions in the underground church in his house in Malaṭya, became convinced of his treason and no longer defended him, even suspecting ʿAmr also of being a Christian.

We come now to the final section of the romance, section 70, which like the preceding one is almost three times longer than the others. It is given up to a description of two important events: the pursuit of ʿUḳba through various countries from Spain to the Yemen, his capture and crucifixion on the Golden Gate at Constantinople in spite of the intervention of a vast army of Christian peoples led by 17 kings; the murderous ambush into which the Muslims fell on their way back, in the Defile of the Anatolians, from which the only survivors were the caliph with 400 men, al-Baṭṭāl and some of his companions, as well as Delhemma, ʿAbd al-Wahhāb and a number of men who had been shut up in a cave and given up for lost, but were miraculously saved by a genie. Soon afterwards al-Muʿtaṣim died.

His successor al-Wāṯhiḳ decided on a reprisal expedition against Constantinople. The emperor was captured and executed. Until then, Muslim conquerors had limited themselves to making the emperors pay tribute. From that time, a Muslim governor was appointed in Constantinople in the person of a son of ʿAbd al-Wahhāb who had the mosque rebuilt with great splendour. The amīr ʿAmr had been killed in the disaster of the Defile of the Anatolians, and was succeeded at Malaṭya by his son al-Ḏjarrāḥ.

At this point the narrator describes the deaths, first of Delhemma, then her son ʿAbd al-Wahhāb, after their return from Mecca, in a state of piety, while al-Baṭṭāl ended his life at Ankūriya (a corruption of Ancyra-Angora through contamination with ʿAmmūriya-Amorium), saddened by the news that, from the time of al-Wāṯhiḳ's successor, al-Mutawakkil (or in some manuscripts al-Muḳtadir), the Byzantines had regained the initiative, reconquered the whole territory between Ankara and Malaṭya, and sent out endless expeditions against the Muslim countries. He died and was buried in the mosque at Ankara, but his tomb, being concealed, escaped the notice of his foes. Islam was to remain in this critical situation until the coming of the Turks (Saldjūḳid?—in some versions there is reference to Čerkesses, hence to the Mamlūks), with their king Āḳ Sunḳur, who recaptured Ankara and discovered al-Baṭṭāl's tomb.

Elements in the romance. Different elements enter into the creation of Delhemma. Firstly, a bedouin element which might be described as "antarian", since it is what occurs in the *Sīrat ʿAntar*, which may have served as a model, as comparisons sometimes appear between some personage and ʿAntar, whose horse Abdjar is mentioned. In the preamble of a Berlin manuscript the narrator, after giving al-Ṣaḥṣāḥ's genealogy, says that the events which he is about to describe took place after the death of ʿAntar b. Shaddād. To this element belong, in the first part of the romance, the intertribal raids and battles, the exploits of al-Ḥāriṯh, his son Djandaba, and later of al-Ṣaḥṣāḥ and Delhemma herself, tales of pursuits and horse-stealing, al-Ṣaḥṣāḥ's romantic encounters with first Laylā, then Amāma, then a djinniyya. In the last analysis these bedouin tales go back to pre-islamic antiquity. It is noteworthy that Islam only plays a subsidiary part (doxology, Muslim talismanic formulae) although the importance of the *ḏjihād* is stressed from the start.

The most important element is the pseudo-historical, for the romance claims to be an accurate history of the Arabs. This element appears as the often very vague recollection of a certain number of facts and historical personages, garbed in romantic trappings and presented in an imaginary way, with constant disregard for chronology and probability. In the internal history of the Umayyad period we find traces of the history of Maslama b. ʿAbd al-Malik and of the eulogy of him spoken by ʿAbd al-Malik on his death-bed; Maslama's renunciation of the throne in favour of al-Walīd rests on a historical basis, Maslama as the son of a non-Arab mother having been barred from the caliphate for that reason. The ʿAbbāsid propaganda and the story of Abū Muslim find an echo in the romance, like the founding of Baghdād by al-Manṣūr. The incident of the Zindīḳ in al-Mahdī's time is transformed into a meeting of 12,000 zindīḳs with renegade Arabs acting in the service of Byzantium. It would be fruitless to reveal the improbabilities and inventions in the story of al-Mahdī's succession, or the account of the Barmakids interwoven with ʿUḳba's intrigues. Similarly a Khāridjī, in revolt against Hārūn al-Rashīd, is endowed with the same characteristics as the Ḳarmaṭi in al-Muḳtadir's time, for he carries off the Black Stone. In the account of al-Baṭṭāl's adventures in the West there is an incredible farrago in which the Spanish Umayyad called Hishām al-Muʾayyad and described as the imām *mahdī*, the Mulaththama (Almoravids) whose king ʿAbd al-Wadūd (a recollection of the ʿAbd al-Wādids of Tlemcen) pays tribute to the Frankish king of Andalusia, and the Maṣāmida (Almohads) all appear. Turks are mentioned in the Muslim army from the time of Hārūn al-Rashīd. We have seen how the war between al-Amīn and al-Maʾmūn is described in terms of the rivalry between the Kilāb and Sulaym. There is only a very brief allusion to the founding of Sāmarrā by al-Muʿtaṣim.

As regards the Arabo-Byzantine war, it is the historical element which plays the chief part. Thus, in the first part Maslama's expedition against Constantinople in 97-9/715-7 is the central event, around which all the romantic episodes are grouped. Al-Baṭṭāl who in actual fact took part in it is not mentioned here because he has been relegated to the second part of the romance. This part, which is based primarily on the Arabo-Byzantine war, reflects several important events of the ʿAbbāsid period, above all the establishment of a group of fortresses west of the Euphrates, with Malaṭya at the centre, dating from the period of al-Manṣūr, a fact well-known from al-Balādhurī. Then came al-Muʿtaṣim's great expedition against Amorium, which inspired several episodes in the romance, either under Hārūn al-Rashīd's caliphate or under al-Muʿtaṣim himself. Finally, and in particular, there is the fact that the amīr of Malaṭya, ʿAmr b. ʿUbayd Allāh, is no other than the historical personage of that name of the 11th century, for whom see M. Canard, *Un personnage de roman arabo-byzantin*, in *RAfr.*, 1932 and H. Grégoire, *L'épopée byzantine et ses rapports avec l'épopée turque et l'épopée romane*, in *Bull. de la Cl. des Let. et des Sc. Mor. et Pol. de l'Ac. roy. de Belgique*, 5th series, volume xvii, and articles in *Byzantion*, v and vi. And as we know from Byzantine historians that ʿAmr was closely connected with the Paulician dissidents, we can deduce that the situation of the Greek Yānis al-Mutaʿarrab, poised between the two camps in his fortress near Malaṭya, reflects the position of the Paulician Carbeas.

If the romance does not trace the Arabo-Byzantine war after the reign of al-Wāthiḳ (227-32/842-7), later events certainly inspired the narrators. It is probable that the disastrous defeat which the Arabs suffered at the end of al-Muʿtaṣim's reign is the counterpart of the defeat in which ʿAmr perished in 249/863. There are many allusions to situations in the 10th century, in the period of the Ḥamdānids. Apart from Malaṭya, the frequent references made to Shimshāt, Ḥiṣn Ziyād (also in the form Kharpūt, which takes us to a still later period), Mayyāfāriḳīn, Dārā, Āmid and the celebrated Byzantine stronghold Kharshana (Charsianon kastron) call to mind Sayf al-Dawla's campaigns. The emigration on two occasions of renegade Arab groups to Byzantium recalls the emigration of the B. Ḥabīb described by Ibn Ḥawḳal. Various Greek names also seem to suggest the events of the 10th century. No doubt it is Corcuas, the conqueror of Melitene, who can be recognized in Ḳarḳiyās, the Domestikos in al-Dimishḳī, Nicephores (Phocas) in Takafūr. In section 47, p. 34 there is a direct reference to John Tzimisces and his siege of Āmid. Armanus suggests Romanus Lecapenus. For the rest, many names and episodes take us to an even later epoch. From the start, the rivalry for the *imāra* between the two tribes reveals a situation which belongs, not to the Umayyad, but rather to the Ayyūbid period, when command of the Syrian tribes was held by one dominant tribe, but at that time the rivalry was between the Kilāb and the Yemeni Faḍl. The ceremonial forms of salutation, hospitality and procession, and the general use of titles are reminiscent of the Fāṭimid, Ayyūbid or Mamlūk ceremonial forms and titles. The Crusades and the Saldjūḳid period are the source of many names of persons and peoples. Among the Christian, or presumably Christian, peoples in addition to the Bulgars, Armenians and Franks, we find ʿAmāliḳa (Amalekites!), Georgians (Kurdj), Abkhāz, Alans, Pečenegs (al-Badjnāk), Amalfitans (Malāfiṭa), Venetians (Banādika), Saḳāliba, Maghlabites (the Byzantine Μαγγλαβίτης = Latin manuclavium, lictor), Zaghāwira, Dūḳas (sic). As names of individuals we find Kundafarūn (Godefroy, cf. Kundafarī in Yāḳūt, i, 207, ii, 381 and Gontofrè in book x of the *Alexiad*), Fransīs, Ghaytafūr who is certainly king Tafūr in the *Chanson d'Antioche*, Bīmund (Bohemund) etc. Certain names of Christians, Greek or French, are simply taken from antiquity and to some extent garbled: Iflāṭūn, Christopher, Pythagoras, Ptolemy. These names reveal a very superficial knowledge of history and geography on the part of the narrators who, on the other hand, seem to be better documented on Christian practices, religious festivals and formulae (*e.g.*, *Kyrie eleison*, sect. 4, 39; 20, 4; 59, 26), the sign of the cross, the emperor's crown topped with a cross, and on certain Byzantine customs (games in the hippodrome, humiliation of prisoners by having a foot placed on the back of the neck, etc.).

The description of land-battles is full of clichés, but the description of naval battles which have inspired prose or verse accounts seem to be more realistic. There is, for example, (sect. 18, 35) a detailed description of the use of Greek fire, *ḳawārīr al-nafṭ*, boarding with the help of grappling-irons and several names of ships.

Folklore element. As in all romances and *Futūḥ* works, Delhemma contains a mass of features derived from folklore, of which we shall only specify a few: tricks to make the enemy kill each other, the description of wonderful objects (automatic birds, talismanic statues), amazons, the use of the *bandj*, etc. In the story of the queen of Georgia, Bakhtūs, which occurs in the first part, one can detect features which go back, through the legend of queen Thamar, to that of Zenobia. The theme of the camel-skin cut into strips in order to obtain a larger area for the building of the mosque in Constantinople is the same as the legend of Dido. Certain names (Kayḳābūs, Ḳilīdj b. Ḳābūs) suggest an Irano-Saldjūḳid influence, rather than the Iranian legend.

Composition of the romance. I have tried to show, in an article entitled *Delhemma, Sayyid Baṭṭāl et Omar al-Noʿmān*, in *Byzantion*, xii (1937), 183 ff., following an article by H. Grégoire in *Byzantion*, xi (1936), 571 ff., on the subject of the relegation of the personage of al-Baṭṭāl, the hero of the Umayyad period, to the legend of ʿAmr b. ʿUbayd Allāh, amīr of Malaṭya in the ʿAbbāsid period, that the romance of Delhemma is made up of two parts which are each a version or fragment of two cycles of different periods and origins. The first and shorter part goes back to a bedouin and Syrio-Umayyad cycle (other fragments of which are incidentally extant) describing the adventures of the Umayyad amīr Maslama b. ʿAbd al-Malik and of personages of the B. Kilāb tribe related to Maslama through his wife. Though this part does not include the historical heroes of the Umayyad period, al-Baṭṭāl and his companion ʿAbd al-Wahhāb who have been relegated to the second part, al-Baṭṭāl's exploits have been put under the name of the Kilābī amīr al-Ṣaḥṣāḥ. The second, the principal and longer part of the romance, very closely related to the Turkish Sayyid Baṭṭāl, represents not only the Turkish romance but also a cycle which H. Grégoire and I have called a Melitenian cycle on account of the part played by Malaṭya-Melitene and its amīr ʿAmr b. ʿUbayd Allāh, of the B. Sulaym tribe in the ʿAbbāsid period. This must originally have been the epic of the B. Sulaym and their famous amīr.

As a result of al-Baṭṭāl's popularity the Sulaym must have appropriated the personage who is described in the romance as being of Sulaymī origin. In H. Grégoire's opinion, this change in respect of al-Baṭṭāl was determined by the fact that in the expedition during which he met his death, he was accompanied by an amīr of Malaṭya named Ghamr, a name easily confused with ʿAmr, and his relegation has also involved a similar change in respect of ʿAbd al-Wahhāb. A later stage in the development of the romance was the fusion of the two cycles and the appropriation of the Melitenian cycle by the B. Kilāb, to their advantage, for the reasons I have given in the article under reference (the submission of the amīrs of Malaṭya to Byzantium in the 10th century, which was frowned upon by Islam; and, on the other hand. the important rôle played by the B. Kilāb in the Byzantine war in the 10th centuries, and their eminence in north Syria). It is in this way that the end of the first part, in which we see the birth and childhood of Delhemma, al-Ṣaḥṣāḥ's granddaughter, and then of her son ʿAbd al-Wahhāb, forms a transition with the second part where the Kilābīs take their place in the Melitenian cycle, that ʿAbd al-Wahhāb, historically an Umayyad *mawlā* of unknown origin, becomes a Kilābī and the principal character, with his mother, that al-Baṭṭāl is represented as voluntarily leaving the B. Sulaym in order to join the B. Kilāb, and that ʿAmr b. ʿUbayd Allāh, the central hero of the Melitenian cycle as he is in the Turkish romance under the name ʿUmar b. al-Nuʿmān (cf. also the story in the 1001 Nights of the same name) becomes a personage not only less important than ʿAbd al-Wahhāb but also less attractive, since the narrators give all their sympathies to the B. Kilāb. Moreover, it is known from Ḳalḳashandī, *Ṣubḥ*, i, 340 and iv, 231, that in his time the romance was regarded as having been written to glorify the B. Kilāb of north Syria who claimed to be adherents of ʿAbd al-Wahhāb.

Date of composition of the romance. It goes without saying that it is impossible to give an exact date for the composition of this romance as we have it in the published edition and in the manuscripts which differ little from it. It is probable that, if the first outlines of the Syrio-Umayyad cycle were traced as early as the Umayyad period, and those of the Melitenian cycle shortly after the death of amīr ʿAmr in 249/863, it was at a much later date, and under the inspiration of the spirit of hostility to the Crusaders, that an epic of the Arabo-Byzantine wars followed by the Islamo-Frankish wars finally took shape. Positive references to an epic of this sort do not go back beyond the 12th century. The Egyptian historian al-Ḳurṭī, writing at the time of vizier Shāwar and the Fāṭimid caliph al-ʿĀḍid (555-67/1160-72), speaks of the *Aḥādīth al-Baṭṭāl* and the 1001 Nights as being known in his time (al-Maḳrīzī, *Khiṭaṭ*, i, 485, ii, 181; cf. Macdonald, in *JRAS*, 1924, 381), a detail which should be added to the article AL-BAṬṬĀL. Samaʿwal b. Yaḥyā al-Maghribī, a Jew converted to Islam in 558/1163, says that before his conversion he took pleasure in reading stories and romances and collections of legendary histories like the *Dīwān akhbār ʿAntara*, the *Dīwān Delhemma wa 'l-Baṭṭāl* (see *Bibl.* to AL-BAṬṬĀL). If we can accept a tradition from al-Mughultāʾī reported in the *Tazyīn al-aswāḳ* by Dāwūd al-Antākī (ed. Būlāḳ, 1279, 55), a Maghribī shaykh was said to have heard the *Sīrat al-Baṭṭāl* recited in Cairo, at the time of al-Ḥākim. Thus a romance dealing with al-Baṭṭāl, or with both Delhemma and al-Baṭṭāl, was known in the Fāṭimid period, and it is difficult to tell if it is a question of one and the same romance, or of two separate romances. A *Sīrat al-Baṭṭāl* is also mentioned by al-Ḳalḳashandī, xiv, 149, l. 9. Can we go back even further? According to H. Grégoire (*ZDMG*, lxxxviii, 213-32), the basis of Delhemma's history and the tale of ʿUmar al-Nuʿmān (see also my article *Un personnage* ...) must have been known in about 390/1000 in north Syria since it served as a source for the Byzantine epic Digenis Akritas.

After this period we find other mentions of Delhemma. In the 8th/14th century Ibn Kathīr (see *Bibl.* to AL-BAṬṬĀL), repeating what Ibn ʿAsākir had said of al-Baṭṭāl, adds that the *Sīra* put out under the name of Delhemma, al-Baṭṭāl, amīr ʿAbd al-Wahhāb and *ḳāḍī* ʿUḳba is no more than a tissue of lies, like the *Sīra* of ʿAntara or the one (on the Prophet) by al-Bakrī [*q.v.*]. In the 16th century, the jurist al-Wansharīshī, in his *al-Miʿyar al-mughrib* (see the analysis by Amar, in *Arch. Marocaines*, xi (1908), 456-7 and the lith. ed. vi, 52), says that it is not permitted to sell historical romances like the one on ʿAntar or the "Dalhama". Today, the disfavour shown by the most critical circles has become even more marked: see the modern contempt for this literature, in Brockelmann, S II, 62.

The author or authors of the romance. In the edition, no author is named, but there is a list of *rāwīs*. A manuscript analysed by Ahlwardt begins: *ḳāla Nadjd b. Hishām al-Hāshimī al-Ḥidjāzī*, as though in reference to the author. But in another, six *rāwīs* are listed, Nadjd being the third. The edition gives ten *rāwīs*, of whom Nadjd, with the ethnic al-ʿĀmirī, that is to say, of the tribe of ʿĀmir who plays a large part in the romance with the related Kilāb, is the last. These persons are unknown and one can scarcely draw any conclusions from the fact that the one has the *nisba* at al-Shimshāṭī, and the other at al-Marʿashī, that is to say, lands situated on the Arabo-Byzantine frontier. The fact that a *rāwī* is stated to have been present at the event described (sect. 18, 64), dated 190 A.H. is merely a device by the narrator.

Conclusion. Such then is this long romance of which our analysis gives only an incomplete idea, so complicated are the adventures of the characters, prolonged at will by the author by means of repetition, the constant return of similar situations, the artificial duplication of characters with identical rôles etc. Such as it is, this epic of the Arabo-Byzantine wars and of the B. Kilāb succeeded in pleasing a popular Muslim public by exalting the *mudjāhidūn* and their successes in battles and against adversaries that were often imaginary. A simple-minded audience accepted all this with enthusiasm as though it were fact. In addition to the epic character, with its accounts of combats and great feats of arms, the dramatic or melodramatic element is not lacking; the narrator is adept in holding his listeners spell-bound waiting for some climax, through agonizing situations, sudden changes of fortune whether happy or unhappy, and by various means rousing sympathy or antipathy. The comical element, at times of a somewhat crude sort, appears fairly frequently, particularly in scenes portraying disguise, abduction or theft, and in the more or less childish devices employed by al-Baṭṭāl and ʿUḳba, the use of various mountebank tricks of which al-Baṭṭāl is past master, when for example he appears as a Christian king with his *ghulām*, in the guise of Christ and the

twelve apostles (cf. a similar story in *Murūdj al-dhahab*, viii, 175).

The personages are simple in character. They resemble each other and always act in the same way, according to the type they represent. The language is incorrect or careless, but at the same time it pretends to seem learned by making a show of rhymed prose and redundant and assonant epithets in descriptions (horses, arms, clothing, combats, receptions, processions). Verse which plays the same part as in the 1001 Nights is relatively infrequent, but section 70 contains a passage of 472 lines of verse in which al-Baṭṭāl himself reviews his exploits.

*Bibliography*: In addition to works referred to in the article, see M. Canard, *Les expéditions des Arabes contre Constantinople dans l'histoire et la légende*, in *JA*, ccviii (1926), 116 ff.; idem, *Delhemma, épopée arabe des guerres arabo-byzantines*, in *Byzantion*, x, 1935; idem, *Les principaux personnages du roman de chevalerie arabe* Ḍāt al-Himma wa-l-Baṭṭāl, in *Arabica*, viii, 1961, 158-73. Mentions or fragmentary analyses in Perron, *Femmes arabes*, 352-3; Lane, *Modern Egyptians*, ed. 1836, ii, 146-162; M. Hartmann, in *OLZ*, 1899, 103; Chauvin, *Bibl. des ouvr. arabes*, iv; Kosegarten, *Chrestomathie*, 68-83 (extract: Djandaba and Ḳattālat al-Shudjʿān); analysis of the beginning and end of the romance by W. Ahlwardt (*Die Handschr.- Verzeichnisse der kgl. Bibl. zu Berlin*, xx. Band; *Verzeichnis der arab. Handschr.*, viii. Band, Berlin 1896; *Grosse Romane*, no. 10, 107 ff.).—Besides the edition noted above, there is another dated 1298 H. (M. CANARD)

**DHU 'L-ḲAʿDA** [see TAʾRĪKH, i].

**DHU 'L-ḲADR**, Turkmen dynasty, which ruled for nearly two centuries (738/1337-928/1522) from Elbistan over the region Marʿash-Malatya, as clients first of the Mamlūk and later of the Ottoman Sultans. Name: The use in Arabic sources of the spellings Dulghādir and Ṭulghādir and in one of the dynasty's inscriptions of Dulḳādir (see R. Hartmann, *Zur Wiedergabe türkischer Namen* ..., Berlin 1952, 7; this spelling occurs also in *Bazm u Razm*, Istanbul 1918, 456) indicates that the Arabicized forms Dhu 'l-Ḳadr and Dhu 'l-Ḳādir, usual in the later Ottoman sources, are a folk-etymology ('powerful') of a (presumably Turkish) name or title : A. von Gabain has suggested *tulga* + *dar*, 'helmet-bearer' (*Isl.* xxxi, 115).

The founder of the dynasty, Zayn al-Dīn Ḳaradja b. Dulḳādir, first mentioned as penetrating Little Armenia with 5000 horsemen in 735/1335, was the leader of Bozoḳ clans whose summer-pastures were in the east range of the Anti-Taurus and who wintered in the valley east of the Amanus range. In the confusion following the death of the Ilkhān Abū Saʿīd, Ḳaradja Beg seized Elbistan and procured from the Mamlūk Sultan a diploma recognizing him as *nāʾib* (738/1337). The rest of his life was spent in struggles with his neighbours and in revolts against Egyptian suzerainty. Defeated at last by a strong force led by the governor of Aleppo, he escaped capture, but was eventually surrendered to the Egyptians by his rival Muḥammad b. Eretna and executed (754/1353).

Ḳaradja's son and successor Khalīl, seeking revenge for his father's betrayal, seized Kharput from the Eretna-oghlu and began to menace Malatya. The Sultan sought to depose him; after several inconclusive expeditions, in 783/1381 the Egyptian forces, driving Khalīl out of Elbistan and advancing as far as Malaṭya, procured his temporary submission. Sultan Barḳūḳ finally resolved to dispose of the turbulent Khalīl by craft and had him murdered (788/1386).

The Turkmens recognized as his successor his younger brother Sūlī, who defeated an Egyptian army near Göksün and allied himself with the rebellious Mamlūk Mintash. Sūlī sent troops to take part in the revolt of the Syrian governors against Barḳūḳ (791/1389); he remained loyal to Mintash for a time after Barḳūḳ's recovery of power, but was obliged to submit in 793/1391. Four years later Barḳūḳ, learning that Sūlī had offered to guide Tīmūr's army into Syria, sent an expedition against him and Sūlī narrowly escaped capture. Barḳūḳ eventually had him murdered (800/1398); but at this juncture the Ottoman Sultan Bāyezīd I arrived on the scene, drove Sūlī's son Ṣadaḳa from Elbistan, and installed Khalīl's son Nāṣir al-Dīn Muḥammad (801/1399). In 803/1400, Tīmūr, whose army had been harassed by the Dhu 'l-Ḳadr Turkmens during the siege of Sivas, ravaged Muḥammad's territories, and on his return from Syria sent a force to attack the Dhu 'l-Ḳadr nomads near Tadmur (Sharaf al-Dīn Yazdī, *Ẓafar-nāma*, Calcutta ed. ii, 270 ff., 346).

Throughout his long reign Muḥammad remained on friendly terms with Egypt, and also with the rising Ottoman state. In 815/1412 he sent troops to assist Meḥemmed I, who had married one of his daughters, against Mūsā (Neshrī, ed. Taeschner, i, 122, 136 f.). He took part in the Egyptian punitive expedition against the Ḳaraman-oghlu in 822/1419, and after its withdrawal defeated him and sent him prisoner to Cairo; for these service the Sultan al-Muʾayyad made over Kayseri to him (where, in 835/1432, he built the Khātūniyye medrese). The Ḳaraman-oghlu Ibrāhīm re-took Kayseri (O. Turan, *Tarihi Takvimler*, 40), but in 840/1436 Muḥammad appealed for help to the Ottoman Sultan Murād II, who captured the city and restored it to him (*IA*, art. Karamanlılar [Şihabeddin Tekindağ], 324 f.). In 843/1440, to restore the temporarily interrupted harmony with Egypt, Muḥammad visited Cairo and married one of his daughters to Čaḳmaḳ; he died, over 80 years of age, in 846. Bertrandon de la Broquière, travelling through Syria in 1432, encountered nomads attached to the Dhu 'l-Ḳadr-oghlu north of Ḥamā, and noted, on passing through his territories, that this prince "a en sa compaignie trente mil hommes d'armes Turquemans" (*Le voyage d'outremer*, ed. C. Schefer, 82, 118).

The twelve-year reign of Muḥammad's son Sulaymān passed uneventfully. In 853/1449 Murād II, seeking an ally against the Ḳaraman-oghlu and the Ḳara-ḳoyunlu sultan (Ducas, 224), married the future Meḥemmed II to Sulaymān's daughter Sitt Khatun (see F. Babinger, *Mehmed's II Heirat mit Sitt-Chatum* (1449), in *Isl.* xxix, 1950, 217-35).

During the reign of Sulaymān's son Malik Arslan (858/1454-870/1465) the principality was menaced by Uzun Ḥasan, who seized Kharput, and Ottoman-Egyptian intrigues for control of the region became intensified. Malik Arslan was murdered, at the instigation of his brother Shāh-budaḳ and with the connivance of the Mamlūk Sultan Khosh-ḳadem, who installed Shāh-budaḳ. But Meḥemmed II sent against him his own candidate Shāh-suvār, another brother (his diploma [see *Bibl.*], dated 14 Rabīʿ II 870/4 December 1465, appointed him *wālī* over his ancestors' domains "and all the dispersed Bozoḳlu and Dhu 'l-Ḳādirlü", *i.e.*, the nomads). Shāh-suvār drove out Shāh-budaḳ, and gained such successes over the Egyptians that he threw off Meḥemmed's